

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 8-11 and 16 have been canceled, and claims 12, 13, and 15 have been amended. Claims 17-20 have been newly added. The amendment of claim 13 has been drafted to overcome the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejection applied thereto. Support for this amendment is provided for example in paragraphs [0069]-[0070] of the published specification. (References herein to the specification and drawings are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the invention to the referenced embodiments.) New claims 17-20 are method claims corresponding to the subject matter of apparatus claims 12-14.

Claims 8-11, 15, and 16 were rejected, under 35 USC §102(e), as being anticipated by Champagne et al. (US 7,310,730). Claims 12 and 13 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Champagne et al. (US 7,310,730) in view of Ooe (US 6,330,238). Claim 14 was rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Champagne et al. (US 7,310,730) in view of Ooe (US 6,330,238) and Dutta et al. (US 7,296,091). To the extent these rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended claims, the Applicants respectfully traverse based on the points set forth below.

Claim 12 defines a broadcast data receiving terminal that determines whether to display received broadcast notification information by referring to stored information indicating whether the broadcast notification is necessary. The terminal references this stored information using the received broadcast notification information as an index to the stored information.

The Office Action acknowledges that Champagne does not disclose the above-mentioned subject matter of claim 12 (see Office Action page 7, last paragraph).

In an attempt to to overcome this deficiency, the Office Action proposes that Ooe discloses a terminal that informs a server node whether to issue a broadcast based on whether a broadcast address received from the server is stored by the terminal (see the Office Action at page 8, lines 2-8).

Claim 12 recites determining whether to display received information based on stored information that is indexed by other received information.

By contrast, Ooe discloses informing a server whether to transmit information based on stored information that is indexed by received information. It is readily apparent that determining whether to display received information is not the same as informing a server whether to transmit information.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Champagne and Ooe, considered individually or in combination, do not render obvious the subject matter defined by the Applicants' claim 12. Independent claim 17 similarly recites the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing apparatus claim 12 from the applied references, but with respect to a method. Therefore, the rejections applied to claim 14 is deemed to be obviated, and allowance of claims 12 and 17 and all claims dependent therefrom is considered to be warranted.

To promote a better understanding of the patentable distinctions of the Applicants' claimed subject matter over the applied references, the Applicants submit the following additional remarks.

Features of claims 12 and 17 include determining whether or not to display received broadcast notification information by referring to a stored broadcast notification information identifier and stored information indicating whether the broadcast notification is necessary or unnecessary using the broadcast notification information identifier contained in received broadcast notification information. The Office Action acknowledges that Champagne does not disclose this subject matter (see Office Action page 7, last paragraph).

Ooe discloses that a data transmitting node adds a multicast address to a data send message and broadcasts the data send message to all receiving nodes (see Ooe abstract, lines 5-9). Each of the nodes receiving the multicast address refers to its own multicast table to decide whether or not a multicast address coincident with the received multicast address exists in the multicast table (see abstract, lines 9-13). If the same multicast address exists, the receiving node makes a request for the transmission of data from the data transmitting node so that the data is transmitted from the data transmitting node to the node making the data transmission request (see abstract, lines 13-19).

That is, Ooe only discloses informing the transmission source node whether transmission of data is necessary or unnecessary. By contrast with this, a feature of the Applicants' claimed invention does not lie in informing a server whether transmission of data is necessary or unnecessary, but lies in determining whether or not broadcast notification information received from the server is displayed. It is submitted that Ooe does not disclose such a feature of the claimed invention.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: March 10, 2009
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 009289-06109
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 659-6966
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559